

THE AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE IN THE AGE OF NEW MEDIA ART

Kateryna SHEVCHUK¹

Abstract: *The article is devoted to philosophical analysis of changes in the contemporary aesthetics. The author pays attention to the aesthetical experiences of new media art. The main features of new media art, relations between traditional aesthetical theory and the modern aesthetics, the specific of experience of media art, and the functioning of beauty are considered. It is also analyzed the similarity between interactive experience and the traditional aesthetic experience.*

Keywords: *aesthetical theory, new media art, aesthetic experience, interactive experience, intentionality*

I. Introduction

One of the most important aspects of the modern aesthetics deals with the specific form of art which is often called as a new media art. There are many famous philosophers (for example, Jean-François Lyotard, Paul Virilio, Wolfgang Iser), who pay attention to the changes of aesthetics and formation of the aesthetics of new media. Problems of media aesthetics grow on the edge of traditional aesthetics and media theory and are related to the need to reinterpret such concepts as media, technique, creativity, imagery, perception, as well as the introduction of new concepts – virtuality, interactivity, immersion, etc. Moreover, it is very important to establish the methodological connections between the philosophical aesthetics and the theory of media. As Krystyna Wilkoszewska argues, the lack of consciousness of the philosophical and aesthetic tradition of media experts often leads to excessive enthusiasm and superficial conclusions, whereas for the philosophers, the sphere of new media is a kind of challenge, since their theoretical views could be limited to classical tradition of thinking and directed to unique works of art, masterpieces².

In the sphere of aesthetics of new media, there are few fundamental issues which need to be explained: 1) the concept of art in the media

¹ Rivne State University of Humanities, Ukraine.

² Wilkoszewska K. (2000). Nowe inspiracje w estetyce drugiej połowy XX wieku, in: *Estetyki filozoficzne XX wieku*, ed. K. Wilkoszewska. Kraków: Universitas, p. 287.

culture; 2) the being status of the art of new media; 3) the aesthetical perception and values in the time of media culture.

The first problem is connected to the fundamental comprehension of the art. Sometimes we can hear about the birth of the “new type” of art. The philosophers try to explain this new type by using the concepts of traditional aesthetics as philosophy of art. However, they understand the necessity to transform the traditional aesthetics. For example, if we are talking about the author, we should emphasize the essential difference between the creative process in which the machine with artificial intelligence participates. Therefore, the process of art creation is usually called the generating. The philosophers pay attention to the changes in the imagination and the essence of art.

The second problem concerns the ontological background of the art of new media. Such background is called immaterial because the media art represents in the virtual reality. For example, the works of electronic art (electronic graphics, satellite art, Internet art), as well as video sculpture, try to establish a specific contact with the recipient. The process of perception of electronic art is defined as “interactivity” as new kind of contact with images. Interactivity is completely two-sided communication between human being and machine. It means that images of this type not only make the viewer to the reaction but also react to the behavior of the recipient. Such images are possible only in the area of *high tech*.

The separate set of the issues of aesthetics of the new media deals with the aesthetical perception. The attention to the problem of *aisthesis* is a necessity of the aesthetics from the late 20th century since the electronic media are operating the speed of light, offering the image of a new generation and making the changes of the entire apparatus of human perception. It is difficult to predict the strength, size, and consequences of these changes. The global nature of these changes indicates that not only images are changing, but also vision and observation. The changes relate to the order of perception, which, on the one hand, is consistent with the linearity of rational thinking, and from another image of the media lose its mimetic property. However, images that arise in the environment of electronic abstraction, appear as a result of not an abstract thought, but the apparatus of sensitivity, which should correspond to the new situation. When in 1985, J.-P. Lyotard organized a multimedia exhibition, he understood the complexity of this situation and set the task for the artists of creating new sensitivity. He tried

to prepare the masses to communicate with phenomena that were produced by the new technologies.

The aim of the present article is to analyze the main changes in the aesthetics under the influence of new media and to show their consequences for understanding the specificity of aesthetic perception.

II. The Conditions of the Contemporary Aesthetics

First of all, we need to pay attention to the fundamental changes in the sphere of aesthetics, which are evident from the 20th century. Since its beginning, aesthetics, as a philosophy of art, sought to be the theoretical foundations of artistic creativity, tried to adequately comprehend artistic phenomena and to justify metamorphoses in the field of artistic practice, which was always focused on the creation of something completely new and original. At the same time, the changes in art, which oriented for the pursuit of novelty, were occurred mainly internally in the sphere of aesthetics, within the classical understanding of the basic principles of figurative creation. Instead, the last decade of the 19th and early 20th centuries were marked by striking transformations of artistic practice that did not fit into the framework of classical aesthetics based on the ideals of the Enlightenment. At the beginning of the 20th century, these processes only intensified and radicalized. At that time there were many artistic phenomena that could not be described by using the classical aesthetic categories. For example, the creators of artistic actions neglected traditional aesthetic values in favor of the implementation of their opposites. The artists paid more attention to “disgusting” things, that provoked, shocked and invoked strong and intense (mostly with a minus sign) experience in recipients. As a result of the exhaustion of the aesthetic paradigm in art, the final break of the new artistic practice and the principles of philosophical aesthetics took place.

The work, which in 1917 launched a true aesthetic revolution, was the “Fountain” by Marcel Duchamp. He deliberately sought to challenge the art critics, so his first *ready-made* caused a radical undermining of the foundations of philosophical aesthetics, which were formed in Immanuel Kant’s *The Critique of Judgement*. In other words, all the classical ideas about form and content, as well as the role of the artist and the recipient in art, were broken in one instant. In addition, an end to the notion of art as an exclusively noble cause was put down. So now everything could be art.

Moreover, the boundary between the artist and the recipient was erased and the artwork could be created not only by the artist but also by the viewer. Thus, the relativization of all key aesthetic categories took place at that time. It became clear that the work of art does not have the inherent truth which deals with beauty. The aesthetic system of concepts and ideas was perceived as relative and conditional.

The traditional notion that the source of aesthetical qualities is only “true” works of art (masterpieces) was changed to the idea that the art can have another solutions and forms which are no less reasonable. For aesthetics as a philosophy (or even science) of art, it was a rather significant challenge. Therefore, the aesthetic problem that arose at that time, had the ontological (the status of the new forms of art) and axiological (the relativism of values) foundations. The artistic phenomena of the 20th century caused a special aesthetic experience and needed to comprehend the possibility of their aesthetic assessment. Thus, aesthetic theory faced two problems: 1) confrontation of classical aesthetics with the phenomena of avant-garde and neo-avant-garde; 2) the need to determine the ability of anaesthetic theory to adequately assess the new artistic phenomena.

If by the middle of the 20th century the question of identity of aesthetics was posed within the framework of philosophy of art, then at the end of the second half of the same century, the most important problem was the discovery of a new form of aesthetics that would go beyond the boundaries of classic forms of art, and even philosophical conceptions. The deep crisis of the model of aesthetics, which protects the autonomy and aesthetic status of art, took place in the middle of the 20th century. An attempt to overcome this crisis is evident in 1970-1980s. At this time, new philosophical theories of art were proposed (Arthur Danto, George Dickie, Joseph Margolis) that devoid of normative and essentials character. However, it is noticeable that this crisis does not lead to decline, but to the development of aesthetics. Welsch argues that we are experiencing a boom of aesthetics today, we live in times of continuous aestheticization – from the culture of consumption through individual stylization to the development of large cities and the whole reality¹.

The transformation of the subject of modern aesthetics requires the transformation of traditional concepts. For example, in the second half of

¹ Welsch W. (1997). *Aesthetics Beyond Aesthetics: Towards a New Form of the Discipline. Literature and aesthetics*, Vol. 7. p. 8.

the 20th century, Lyotard wrote about the widening of the boundaries of aesthetics and the need for the transformation of its traditional concepts. He argued that *mimesis* is changed by the creative imagination, which is the only criterion that determines the right to creativity. In modern art, there is a transition from experience to experiment. We can also find the refusal from the traditional categories such as “artists” and “recipient”. Lyotard has the belief that creation is always a creation for someone – and according to communicative activity, the product itself produces its recipients. In this way, he proposes a kind of communicative situation as a background for the aesthetical experience. The artist and the recipient are able to communicate through the work of art – they become equal partners in a communicative situation, in which the artwork does not accent its metaphysical connotations but becomes the pure narrative¹.

For the aesthetical experience in modern times, the emotional shake that appears in an aesthetic situation and supported by intellectual pleasure or negative emotional experience is important². Therefore, it is no coincidence that postmodern aesthetics is characterized by theories that focus their interest not on the aesthetic values of art, but on its cognitive, communicative or ideological functions (for example, N. Goodman, A. Danto, U. Eco, etc.) or on issues of understanding and interpreting the work of art (for example, different versions of hermeneutics and interpretation theory).

Aesthetics did not escape from the popular in the 20th century research strategy which was represented by the prefix “re-”: restructuring, reconstruction, revision, etc. Moreover, aesthetics subjected to deconstructive and reconstructive operations faced the problem of determining its identity as a discipline of knowledge. This problem is complicated since it concerns not only the internal transformations of aesthetics but also the whole context of culture, which also seeks its own identity in its different manifestations (art, science, religion, politics).

The changes in aesthetics are still evident if we refer to the philosophical hermeneutics (Hans-Georg Gadamer). It proposes two ideas

¹ Lyotard J. F. (1989). Philosophy and Painting in the Age of Their Experimentation: Contribution to an Idea of Postmodernity, in: *The Lyotard Reader*, ed. Andrew Benjamin, Oxford, p. 190.

² Dziemidok B. (2002). *Główne kontrowersje estetyki współczesnej*. Warszawa: PWN, p. 305

that are important for the new media art: 1) play as a form of being of the art; 2) contemporaneity of the artwork.

Gadamer does not accept the autonomy of aesthetical sphere of culture because the context of an artwork is ignored. Art cannot be excluded from the world in which it arose, and the art experience (an aesthetic experience) cannot be separated from our own life and our world.

Within the philosophical hermeneutics, the art is comprehended through the play. This conception is useful for analysis of aesthetical experience in case of the new art because the contemporary art often demonstrates the situation of the game with the recipient. The game for Gadamer is a way of being an artwork. But the product of art is not the subject or object of the game, so the simple subject-object relation is overcome here. With the help of the game self-presentation of a work of art is carried out. Gadamer writes: "When we speak of play in reference to the experience of art, this means neither the orientation nor even the state of mind of the creator or of those enjoying the work of art, nor the freedom of a subjectivity engaged in play, but the mode of being of the work of art itself"¹. The game in which the work of art is represented implies that we are dealing with experiences that change the person who is experiencing it. According to Gadamer, play itself contains its own, even sacred, seriousness. Also, he adds that all purposive relations that determine active and caring existence have not simply disappeared, but are curiously suspended in playing. Therefore, the player feels and knows that play has priority before his consciousness. In other words, we perceive the game as a reality that exceeds us. So, the play transforms the experience of the player.

The work of art should be understood as an ontological event. The game realizes this possibility because it assumes that we lose control over the perception of the work of art, fully subjected to the process of the game. The work of art presented is not only the world of its creator. He exists as something self-sufficient. Transformation of the work of art into self-sufficiency involves the assertion of truth. The structure of the work of art does not exist beyond interpretation and cannot be an abstraction. The relation of structure to the world is provided by interpretation. But this relation does not connect with the author's world, but it deals with the world of the interpreter.

¹ Gadamer H.-G. (2004). *Truth and Method*, London: Continuum, p. 102.

Since the work of art is connected with the world of the interpreter, the important feature of its ontological structure is contemporaneity. As Gadamer writes, "'contemporaneity' belongs to the being of the work of art. It constitutes the essence of 'being present.' This is not the simultaneity of aesthetic consciousness, for that simply means that several objects of aesthetic experience (Erlebnis) are all held in consciousness at the same time – all indifferently, with the same claim to validity. 'Contemporaneity,' on the other hand, means that in its presentation this particular thing that presents itself to us achieves full presence, however, remote its origin may be. Thus contemporaneity is not a mode of givenness."¹ Also, he adds that "contemporaneity" is a task for our consciousness. So, we can get to the essence of being of artwork by interpretation and feeling of the presence. Through presenting in the process of interpretation, the work of art acquires presence (contemporaneity).

III. The Essence of New Media

In order to understand the specifics of the aesthetics of new media, it is worth considering the essence of the new media and identifying their special features that affect the art. The emergence of the new generation of the Internet, outlined by the concept of Web 2.0 (Tim O'Reilly²), led to a discussion of new opportunities for creating a culture and unknown to this time measurements of human existence. New media characterized by numerical representation, modularity, automation, variability, and transcoding, which make possible to create the hypermedia through convergence processes and discovering the new dimensions of culture. In assessments of these cultural transformations, we can observe quite contradictory positions. On the one hand, the creation of new media and cultural phenomena that accompany this process are perceived as a qualitatively new state of society and culture (known lawyer and cyber activist Lawrence Lessig, for example, argues about the transition from the culture of R/O, "read/only" to the R/W culture, "read/write" characterized by openness and lack of distinctiveness between the creator of cultural

¹ *Ibid*, p. 123.

² O'Reilly T. (2005). *What Is Web 2.0*. <http://www.oreilly.com/pub/a/web2/archive/what-is-web-20.html>

products and their consumer¹). On the other hand, new media, the information society and cyberculture are criticized (for example, Slavoj Žižek draws attention to the fact that the interactivity of new media, which often connected with hope that it will enable the participation of a large number of people in the creation of culture, always favors interpassivity when the subject allegedly passes his action to the media, transforming only into means of symbolic registration²).

In general, a kind of informationalism is established in culture, which can be described as a new paradigm that begins to dominate over the industrialism by virtue of the fact that intangible goods gain greater value than material, as well as through greater productivity in the cultivation of cultural goods and the realization of power. Manuel Castells presented the concept of informationalism, defining it as a technological paradigm based on increasing human capabilities in processing information through the use of parallel revolutions – the revolution in microelectronics and the revolution in genetic engineering³. Castels distinguishes a number of features of modern information technology, such as accumulation of knowledge, more and more complicated processes of information processing, the fetishization of technology, the ability to instantly connect all with all. In general, the consequence of the adoption of informationalism for culture is that it changes the essence, organization, and development of cultural phenomena.

The new media are characterized by the «information culture» parallel to the visual culture. The manifestation of such kind of culture is a way of presenting objects and cultural places, examples of interaction with them and with devices that broadcast them, for example, with different forms of screens.

Cultural objects of new media, which include works of art transferred to the virtual space or created using computers in cyberspace, are subject to the rules and logic of the functioning of devices in the digital paradigm.

¹ Lessig L. (2008). *Remix: Making Art and Commerce Thrive in the Hybrid Economy*. London: Bloomsbury, pp. 28-31.

² Žižek S. (2007). *How to Read Lacan*. New York: W W. Norton & Company, Inc, pp. 22-39.

³ Castells M. (2004). *Informationalism, Networks, and the Network Society: a Theoretical Blueprint*. <https://annenberg.usc.edu/sites/default/files/2015/04/28/Informationalism%2C%20Networks%20and%20the%20Network%20Society.pdf>

The production of new media is massive. All this leads to the gap between the objects of art and production products since artists often realize the commercial orders. As a result, new standards and new arrangements arise, and the “language” of new media appears.

Objects of multimedia art seek to represent objects of reality that are historically contained in other cultural phenomena. However, this representation is always one-dimensional, because it selects some features of real objects, while others are missed. Interfaces are a specific representation, since they selectively organize processes of perception and ordering of the presented world. Thus, these representations are simulations, forms of creation and management of illusions, telecommunications and information in itself, because they are products of computer technologies and influenced to change the language of culture¹.

The main characteristic of new media is their cultural transcoding. They have a dual structure: the computer level (programming) and the cultural level (phenomena of communicative culture). Cultural transcoding consists in the possibility of translating some cultural meanings into others.

Cultural and computer levels affect each other. As I. Fiut states, the result of such mutual influence is the process of re-medialization. All technological innovation in the communication process is transformed by a person in a specific way when it corresponds to a human natural manner of perception. This process should help the successful communication in the field of culture².

The mutual influence of these two levels in the process of transcoding consists in embedding from both levels one element to the other, resulting in a new culture that is a mixture of the traditional human meanings and the new logic of information technologies. This influence causes significant changes in the conditions for the creation and perception of objects of new media, including artistic objects. In the process of interacting with digital media objects, the user can create and transform objects, manipulate, control and manage them, as well as the entire context of the network.

Moreover, the technology of new media functions as a perfectly implemented utopia of the ideal society of unique individuals. The new

¹ Ostrowicki M. (2006). *Wirtualne realis. Estetyka w epoce elektroniki*. Kraków: Universitas, pp. 74-81.

² See: Fiut I. (2007). *Estetyka przeżycia interaktywnego*, in: *Wizjeire-wizje. Wielka księga estetyki w Polsce*, ed. K. Wilkoszewska. Kraków: Universitas, pp. 555-568.

media assures that the choice of their users is unique and not programmed in advance.

Thus, on the technical side, interactivity is the user's choice of elements of the object to be covered or the ways of their development. The possibilities of developing interactive user actions are closely related to the interactive human-computer interface, which means that each object that appears on the monitor is, to a large extent, interactive. Since the computer became the object of mass use, the interface became a kind of filter and began to function as a code through which cultural narratives appeared in the media. However, this code can change the narrative and make the dominant its own logic, ideology, and model of the world¹.

Thus, the art of new media experiences double influence: on the one hand, media are endowed with the function of human communicative instruments, and on the other hand, the form of a narrative created by media can be altered by the action of media (or even hypermedia) logic. All of this determines the specifics of aesthetic experience in the conditions of informationalism.

IV. The Aesthetic Experience of New Media Art

Aesthetical experience is a key concept for understanding any kind of art. As Gadamer writes, "Since aesthetic experience, as was said above, is an exemplary instance of the meaning of the concept *Erlebnis* [experience – K. S.], it is clear that the concept of *Erlebnis* is a determining feature of the foundation of art. The work of art is understood as the consummation of the symbolic representation of life, and towards this consummation every experience already tends. Hence it is itself marked out as the object of aesthetic experience. For aesthetics, the conclusion follows that so-called *Erlebniskunst* (art based on experience) is art per se"². In case of new media art, we deal with the aesthetical dimension of interactive experience which needs to be explained in details.

The interactive experience in the aesthetic aspect is related to the perception of new media art, i.e. artistic objects in cyberspace. The perception of this kind is called cyber perception. His main difference from the traditional perception is that it is carried out using the interface

¹ *Ibid*, pp. 554-568.

² Gadamer H.-G. (2004). *Truth and Method*, London: Continuum, p. 61.

“human being – computer”. This is important for the intensity and development of the integrity of such experience, which causes that both the creator and the recipient deliberately become interactors¹.

Thus, in the process of communicating with the art of new media, we have the creation of artifacts of aesthetic nature and the conduct of subsequent acts of their cyber-perception before the development of the aesthetic experience of the interactors. In subsequent phases, there is the creation of aesthetic objects that cause the following phases of cyber-perception.

In this part of the article, I will try to analyze the specifics of the aesthetic experience of the art of new media in the perspective of the phenomenological tradition, within which there is its own concept of aesthetics. This tradition of philosophy pays a lot of attention to the problem of aesthetic experience. It is known that the phenomenological tradition, in particular, the aesthetic theory of Roman Ingarden, has developed a method of direct penetration into the process of aesthetic perception, expanding it into phases of observation, knowledge, experience, contemplation, constitution, and concretization. All these phases can be distinguished in the process of aesthetic experience of artistic objects. Roman Ingarden’s model of the process of aesthetic experience can also be used to analyze the aesthetic dimension of an interactive experience in the sphere of new media.

According to R. Ingarden’s theory, aesthetic experiences can have a “two-faced” character and cause the creation of many aesthetic objects, even opposite. Sometimes the whole series of aesthetic objects are generated and specified in the following works. The purpose of this process is to find new forms of aesthetic qualities in harmonious integrity and connection with the mutual modification of those qualities in the following groups of them².

In the case of interactive experiences, which appear as a result of communication of interactors (creators and recipients) with artistic objects in cyberspace, we are dealing with a similar situation. Creation of groups of qualities, in this case, is also connected with the desire to create aesthetic subjects. In the initial phases of the process of contemplation carried out by

¹ See: Wojtowicz E. (2003). Cyberception: Where Art Ends and Technology Begins. *Art Inquiry*, Vol. V (XIV), pp. 77-79.

² Ingarden R. (1966). *Studia estetyki*. T. 1. Warszawa, pp. 121-155.

interactive agents, new dimensions of the qualities of aesthetic values present in interactive objects are opened. As a result, the aesthetic process is built upon experience and can lead to an understanding of these interactive objects as a source of aesthetic objects. Although it can recruit negative forms and reject the possibility of grouping qualities within this artistic object in the form of theaesthetic subject. If to concentrate on the second possible variant of the direction of aesthetic experience, then, according to R. Ingarden, it is possible to lose the basic meaning of aesthetic experience, namely, the formation of aesthetic objects. As a result, there will be a repulsion of the subject (interactor) from recognizing the actual aesthetic values, provided that they are established there at all¹.

Thus, the concept of aesthetic experience presented in phenomenological aesthetics helps to better understand the process of experiencing an interactive nature. We can also distinguish communication with artistic objects of new media users, whose experiences, as a result of the revival of aesthetic interests, are often not aesthetically pleasing, and their experiences do not lead to the full creation of aesthetic objects, based on interactive objects in cyberspace. The constant change and evolution of interfaces in user contacts with artistic objects have the biggest impact on this aesthetic processes. These changes open up to the recipients the various interactive communication with the works of art of new media, i.e., their selection, knowledge, perception, and creation as objects of aesthetic experience.

The Ingarden's concept of the aesthetic experience is so significant theoretical construction that allows us to describe and capture the important moments of the interactive aesthetic experience. It reveals many similar moments, but also many differences between traditional and interactive experiences. In both of these kinds of aesthetic experience, there are some basic stages such as isolation, cognition, experience, contemplation, and specification.

The essential aspect that connects these two forms of aesthetic experience – traditional and interactive – is the question of intentionality. In the traditional experience, it disappears in the stage of cognition. On an interactive basis, it can also disappear when the aesthetic subject is formed. Clarifying the modular and variability of the objects in the network, Leo Manovich writes that automation turns off the intentional processes of

¹ *Ibid*, pp. 151-153.

Internet users. In some extend the automation takes on the functionality of the intentionality, albeit with certain limitations associated with the capabilities of the interface and the software. This, however, does not mean that the stages of contemplation and concretization are absent in the interactive aesthetic experience. These stages are accelerated and intensified, and the automation is continuing the intentionality in the space of the Impression experience, thus allowing the user to quickly and more accurately create and transform the aesthetic object¹. Confirmation could be found in the writings of philosophers (for example, Marshall McLuhan) who claim that media is a continuation of human cognitive capabilities, not only empirically-rational forms of his perception apparatus but also intuitive and emotional perception.

Thus, an interactive aesthetic experience includes the same stages that are typical of the traditional aesthetic experience. However, the difference is in the velocity and duration of the stages of the experience, as well as in the depth of aesthetic qualities in the stage of their recognizing by the subjects of aesthetic process. The interactivity of the experience gives it the intensity and pace. The electronic medium increases its field, which explains the specifics of this type of experience as an extreme case in the fields of the traditional model of aesthetic. In addition, contemplation takes on other forms associated with the pace and diversity of the recognizing of the aesthetic qualities of the human-computer interface in the process of perceiving artistic objects in cyberspace.

V. Conclusion

The art of new media demonstrates new possibilities for the realization of aesthetic experience. One of the main aesthetic values has always been considered beauty. Within the framework of media art, there is a transgression of beauty. Thus, the problem of understanding the various ways of functioning of beauty, its manifestations and embodiment, especially when it comes to the beautiful, which is used in electronic media, is actualized. This is assisted by the following properties of beauty as the satisfaction and desire associated with positive emotional experiences, the ability to transgression or receptivity, which is an expression of the presence of beauty and leads to the fact that the beauty can be “realized”.

¹ See: Manovich L. (2001). *The Language of New Media*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

In connection with the use of information technology within the framework of the realization of the aesthetic experience, the idealization of the subject occurs. For example, contemporary computer graphics, new methods for creating large-format photographs help aestheticize our everyday lives. Although this is connected with the danger that the messages generated by technological aestheticization, saturated with many elements to please the recipients, often come under the power of a stereotype and a kitsch.

The development of digital media technologies contributes to the leveling of the difference between ways of perceiving different forms of the functioning of beauty. Previously it was believed that the aesthetic experience of nature differs from the perception of art because in the aesthetic knowledge of nature, all feelings are involved, while various types of art involve separate feelings: fine arts – visual senses, music – hearing, cinema – visual and auditory etc. With the advent of digital technologies that create the virtual world, where demolition of any limits is taking place, the participation in the perception of many sensations takes place. This is how the whole aesthetic experience is born, which manifests itself in connection with the basic principles of aesthetics as a philosophy of art.

References

- CASTELLS, M. (2004). *Informationalism, Networks, and the Network Society: a Theoretical Blueprint*. [https://annenberg.usc.edu/sites/default/files/2015/04/ 28/ Informationalism%2C%20Networks%20and%20the%20Network%20Society.pdf](https://annenberg.usc.edu/sites/default/files/2015/04/28/Informationalism%2C%20Networks%20and%20the%20Network%20Society.pdf)
- DZIEMIDOK, B. (2002). *Główne kontrowersje estetyki współczesnej*. Warszawa: PWN.
- FIUT, I. (2007). Estetyka przeżycia interaktywnego, in: *Wizje i wizje. Wielka księga estetyki w Polsce*, ed. K. Wilkoszewska. Kraków: Universitas, pp. 555-568.
- GADAMER, H.-G. (2004). *Truth and Method*, London: Continuum.
- INGARDEN, R. (1966). *Studia z estetyki*. T. 1. Warszawa, pp. 121-155.
- LESSIG, L. (2008). *Remix: Making Art and Commerce Thrive in the Hybrid Economy*. London: Bloomsbury.
- LYOTARD, J. F. (1989). Philosophy and Painting in the Age of Their Experimentation: Contribution to an Idea of Postmodernity, in: *The Lyotard Reader*, ed. Andrew Benjamin, Oxford, pp.181-195.
- MANOVICH, L. (2001). *The Language of New Media*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- O'RAILLY, T. (2005). *What Is Web 2.0*. [http://www.oreilly.com/pub/a/web2/archive/ what-is-web-20.html](http://www.oreilly.com/pub/a/web2/archive/what-is-web-20.html)

- OSTROWICKI, M. (2006). *Wirtualne realis. Estetyka w epoce elektroniki*. Kraków: Universitas.
- WELSCH, W. (1997). Aesthetics Beyond Aesthetics: Towards a New Form of the Discipline. *Literature and aesthetics*, Vol. 7. p. 8.
- WILKOSZEWSKA, K. (2000). Nowe inspiracje w estetyce drugiej połowy XX wieku, in: *Estetyki filozoficzne XX wieku*, ed. K. Wilkoszewska. Kraków: Universitas, pp. 281-308.
- WOJTOWICZ, E. (2003). Cyberception: Where Art Ends and Technology Begins. *Art Inquiry*, Vol. V (XIV), pp. 71-84.
- ŽIŽEK, S. (2007). *How to Read Lacan*. New York: W W. Norton & Company, Inc.